

APPLICATION NO.

09/757,963

758

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

FILING DATE

01/10/2001

7590 FENWICK & WEST LLP

SILICON VALLEY CENTER

**801 CALIFORNIA STREET** MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

01/23/2004

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P. D. P. M. 1450

r.U. BOX 1430) Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov		
	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	HVWD-01008US0	9385
	MEM/SBS	•

EXAMINER MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2131

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

John S. Flowers

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
. Advisory Action	09/757,963	FLOWERS ET AL.		
Advisory Addish	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Aravind K Moorthy	2131		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 31 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice  i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP	
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in	
<ul><li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's</li><li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li></ul>				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:			
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note t	pelow);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the	
<ul> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ul>		to issues which we	ere newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.		
P.☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10. Other:		EMMANUEL L. MI PRIMARY EXAMI		
		A/4 2/36		





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that Huff discloses only an IDS that is aware of only actual intrusions. The applicant argues that Huff fails to disclose a VDS. The applicant argues that Huff that the agents are not aware of potential attacks but of only actual attacks. The applicant argues that Huff fails to distinguish the vulnerabilities of one host from other hosts while examining traffic. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that the IDS is aware of actual attacks and suspected threats and also it is not claimed that the IDS is aware of only potential attacks. As cited by the examiner in the previous action, Huff does discloses an agent that is capable of gathering information about the network to determine vulnerabilities of the hosts on the network. Huff is able to distinguish threats on each node...